

[Mr. P. T. Rajan] [3rd November 1931]

“ Sir, the payment of Rs. 48,000 was agreed to for the simple reason that by this compromise Government would be the gainer. In view of that, I do hope that the Council will approve of the payment of the above sum to the contractor.”

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

III.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1920.

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—“ I beg to present the Report^a of the Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill to amend the Madras Elementary Education Act, 1920 (Bill No. 24 of 1931) and move that the Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration.”

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—“ I second it.”

The motion was put and carried.

Clauses 1 to 9 were put and carried.

Clause 10.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“ Let the hon. Member Mr. Nachiyappa Goundar move only the amendment to sub-clause (2).”

Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDAR:—“ I beg to move the amendment that stands in my name as follows:—

‘ For the proposed sub-section (2) of section 47 and the proviso thereto, substitute the following, viz.,

(2) No fees shall be levied from any such child at any other elementary school situated in the said area:

Provided that the loss of fee income calculated at standard rates as prescribed shall be paid to such school by the local authority or panchayat concerned by way of compensation from its elementary education fund.’

“ In moving this amendment I should like to say only a few words. In areas where compulsion is introduced the local bodies also are levying education cess and collecting the same from the poor parents. Every parent is compelled to send his children to any public school that may be situated in his locality (not necessarily a school established by the local body) and if he fails to do this, he is punishable under the Act. If there is no public school run by a local body in a place, the parent has perforce to send his children to the aided institution which is situated close by. According to the clause as it stands in the Bill, fees may be levied by aided institutions. The parents pay education cess to the local boards and in return for that they must get some benefit. If there are no schools maintained by local boards, the poor parents will have to send their children to aided institutions. In this way these poor persons are taxed in both the ways, i.e., they will have to pay education cess

3rd November 1931] [Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Goundar]

and also fees to the aided schools. If the aided institutions were to begin levying fees from pupils, naturally they will seek admission in schools run by local authorities. If that happens, the aided institutions will have to end their days. In such a case the local bodies will have to increase the number of schools to meet the demand and they will have to spend a good lot of money. What I propose in my amendment is that instead of spending a good lot of money over these schools, I think the question may be amicably settled by giving a little compensation to the aided managers and forcing them not to levy fees in any aided institutions. So in order to save the funds of the local bodies and in order that the benefit of compulsory education may be enjoyed by all the people and in order that all the aided institutions may also survive, I propose this amendment."

Mr. M. A. MANIKAVELU NAYAKAR:—"I second the amendment."

* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"An important question is involved in this amendment. The point is what should be the ideal for the Corporation or the local bodies whether they should have schools started and run by them or schools aided by them. That is the most important question. If it is the idea that only schools started and run by local bodies should come into existence, and that these aided schools are only make-shifts, then I think this amendment should be rejected. But if it is thought that these aided schools can take the place of schools run by local bodies permanently, then this amendment may be accepted by the Government. I think the policy of the Government is that only schools started and run by local bodies should come into existence, gradually replacing the aided schools. If that is so, the elementary education funds cannot be utilized for giving aid to these make-shift aided schools. That is my idea. Of course, if this amendment is accepted the local bodies can easily close their schools and then have a number of aided schools and the cost of maintaining such schools will be much lower than it would otherwise be. No doubt about that. No doubt the ideal is compulsory education should be free. But can that ideal be reached now? Even the framers of the Act did not contemplate that they would be able to achieve that ideal immediately. It is therefore that they provided that in cases where they could not start schools where education could not be made free, there should be no compulsion. Here also the same thing is done. The amendment runs counter to such a proposal. There is another thing in the amendment. There is an assumption that rich pupils only gather in free schools and poor pupils in aided schools. That may not be the case. A rich parent may find to his gain to send his children to these aided schools where better attention may be had from persons who receive some remuneration for that.

"The teacher in a Corporation school who has no personal gain to 1 p.m. look for will not take so much interest and pay so much attention. It is only human nature and it is idle to expect the teachers of the city of Madras to do otherwise. They must be really super-human beings if such a thing was to be expected from them. I therefore oppose this amendment."

[3rd November 1931]

MR. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Sir, the most important provision of this Bill is that relating to the levy of fees in aided institutions. This provision has met with considerable opposition. The hon. Minister is taking a thoroughly retrograde step of going back on the long accepted policy of Government to impart free and compulsory elementary education to children in this Presidency. I am sure this Bill will be a big debit item in the record of this ministry. I am sure the House is familiar with the popular demand for a system of free and compulsory education in this country from the time of the late Mr. Gokhale and the strong reasons which have induced governments in this country to accept that principle. Those reasons—I do not want to weary the House by repeating them here—hold good now quite as much as they did at the time when the principle was accepted by the Government. But the hon. Minister here in a very light-hearted way wants to go back several years and upset the whole achievement of the Government and the public. I am sorry that in this retrograde step he is taking he wants to make the Corporation and the managers of aided schools in the city his scapegoats. The truth of the matter is this: the Government are not in a position to finance the local bodies who are willing to levy an education cess and make education free and compulsory in their areas. If the hon. Minister says so, this Council will sympathise with him and agree to suspend the Act for the time being. But on the other hand if he wants to throw the blame on the Corporation and the managers of aided institutions I must strongly protest against it.

"The object of constituting the Elementary Education Fund is to enable the local body concerned to impart free and compulsory primary education in the area of the local body. Wherever education is made compulsory, it should also be free; otherwise it would work as a great hardship on the parents of poor children, like those who come from the depressed classes. Even now in certain areas where compulsion has been introduced, the local authority has to give the midday meal to poor children, so that the poor parents may not feel the education of their children a burden. Without this inducement the local authority finds it difficult to compel the poor people to send their children to school. The hon. Minister wants to ask the aided institutions which are now serving the needs of two-thirds of the school-going children to levy fees. It is no doubt due to the agitation of the managers of these institutions in a way. They were not satisfied with the somewhat indefinite and uncertain payments of compensation by the Corporation. They wanted to be sure of their income and with that object in view they asked for permission to levy fees from their pupils. Evidently the hon. Minister thought it was a good opportunity to kill two birds at a stroke; he would be granting the request of the managers of these aided schools and at the same time he would be satisfying his colleague, the Finance Member, by seeing that the Government money in the Education Fund was not diverted for the purpose of aiding these institutions. But I am afraid both these objects will not be achieved in the way in which the hon. Minister expects.

3rd November 1931] [Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti]

“ The Education Fund is composed of the amount which the local authority was spending on education before the introduction of compulsion, the proceeds of the levy of the education cess and an equivalent amount contributed by Government. Out of this fund the local authority has to pay for the maintenance of not only its own schools but also for the schools run by private management. So long as the aided institutions are efficient as shown by the fact that they receive recognition year after year from the Education Department, they should be considered quite useful institutions. There is no meaning in killing aided institutions because they are only aided institutions. If a local authority runs its own school, it must be only to point out the right lines on which a school should be run and set a model for other private institutions. If aided schools are not encouraged, then private enterprise in this wide field of education will be killed and the local authority will be unable to discharge its responsibility of educating all the children in the area. It is with this end in view that the Madras Corporation allowed aided schools to continue, although in the beginning Government framed rules saying that they would be aided only for five years and later on revised the rules saying that compensation might be paid indefinitely so long as the schools continued to be efficient. What would happen if these aided schools were closed? The Corporation would be compelled to open new schools. It costs $1\frac{1}{2}$ times as much as the compensation paid to an aided school to maintain a Corporation school. It is a very uneconomical policy. I do not see why Government should object to the Corporation paying this compensation out of the Elementary Education Fund. It looks as though the Government is afraid that other local authorities, not only the Madras Corporation, will introduce compulsory education, levy the education cess and compel the Government to pay an equivalent amount. If that is the fear of the Government, let them say so openly and admit that our finances will not permit the introduction of compulsory education. Then the local authorities will withdraw their proclamations regarding compulsion. So far as the Madras Corporation is concerned, they cannot continue to impose this compulsion without at the same time making due provision for additional schools in the place of the aided schools which will be displaced now. Naturally they will have to levy more education cess or ask the Government to help them. If education cess is levied the public will ask what return they get for the cess they pay. Surely you cannot levy the education cess and still ask the parents to pay fees for their children. Unless you made education free, what is the reasonableness of your levying an education cess? If a man is able to pay for the education of his children, why should he be asked to pay not merely the fees but also the education cess for the sake of other children? That will be a double hardship upon these so-called rich people. Why should rich men be taxed not only for their luxuries but also for something else for which they are not responsible? I therefore beg of the hon. Minister not to heed the clamour of these aided school managers to permit them to levy fees. I understand that later on these managers have revised their views and come to see that after all it is far better and easier to get a cheque from Government or the local

[Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti] [3rd November 1931]

authority than to take all the trouble of collecting fees from students and wait till the end of the month. Moreover for the last five or six years the public of Madras have been accustomed to free education and if we now introduced the levy of fees how many children would continue in school? You would also be dislocating the programme of schools managed by trusts. They have all along been relying on the compensation paid by the local authority and when that compensation is no longer forthcoming, they will have to alter their budgets accordingly. Again, there are many excellent aided schools near the Corporation schools. If the aided schools were to get no compensation and consequently had to levy fees, how would children go there when they have a free Corporation school near by? Therefore the result of this Bill will be that you will not merely be killing some inefficient aided schools (the hon. Mr. Kumaraswami Reddiyar: So much the better)—I agree so far—but you will also be obliterating from the education map of the city many efficient and well managed schools which are very well serving a real need. You will force the hands of the Madras Corporation to open new schools of their own at a much higher cost.

“I would not be surprised if the experience of the working of the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act repeats itself in a similar way with regard to this Act. I have no doubt that three months afterwards my hon. Friend, Mr. James, will come forward in this Council and ask for the repeal of the Bill, unless it be that he stands on prestige and refuses to do it. The Corporation would be put to the necessity of either withdrawing compulsion or opening more of their own schools. If we withdrew compulsion, we would be putting back the clock of progress in the matter of elementary education and cause keen disappointment to the people who have all along been expecting the Government to pursue steadfastly a programme of free and compulsory elementary education.”

1-15
p.m.

* MR. YAKUB HASAN:—“Mr. President, Sir, I am sure that the hon. Minister is as anxious as any one of us, that no obstacle should be placed in the spread of elementary education. But the present Bill is calculated to create great difficulties in the way of the spread of elementary education. Having started on the principle that elementary education should be compulsory as well as free, any departure from that principle will launch us in great difficulties indeed. I have no objection to fees being levied in certain schools where the education imparted is of better kind than what is obtained in schools that are maintained by the Corporation and by public bodies, which impart education of a most elementary kind. People who require better education would not send their children to the schools maintained by the Corporation and other public bodies.

“There should be, at the same time, other schools where better education is imparted; in that case people would be willing to pay for the education of their children in those schools. In a locality where there is no public school where free education is given but there is a private school and the latter school is availed of to provide education in that area, in that case, that school should impart education free

3rd November 1931] [Mr. Yakub Hasan]

and no fees should be levied. If on the other hand that school is allowed to levy fees, difficulty will arise about the number of free seats that are to be provided in that school. I am sure the local authorities would be put to great difficulty in this matter. There may be need for more free seats than the school may be willing to provide. For example, suppose there is accommodation for 100 boys in a school; but the children in that area of the school-going age are more than 100 whose education is to be provided for. In that case what proportion would be fixed for free seats in that school?

“ Besides, when education is to be compulsory as well as free, no boys should be asked to pay fees especially in a school where there are other boys who are not paying fees; otherwise, there would be distinction between the various boys in the school. In a free school, no boy should be asked to pay fees, though there may be boys in that school, whose parents are rich enough to pay. In a school, the distinction of some boys paying fees and other boys not paying fees, should not be made at all. If a school provides only an elementary type of education, why should the people who send their children to that school, be required to pay for the education which is not at all better than that provided in another school in that locality? There should be no fee in schools which are brought into existence or pressed into service under the provisions of this Act. But there may be schools where fees may be levied, provided there are within one mile other schools where fees are not levied. On this principle itself, I oppose this amendment to the Act. If the Council passes this Bill, it will be greatly detrimental to the spread of elementary education to the extent we want.”

* Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—“ Sir, I propose to move the following amendment:—

‘ Omit the following words “ calculated at standard rates as prescribed ” in the proviso given notice of and moved by Mr. Nachiappa Goundar. ’

“ This amendment raises issues of a very fundamental nature regarding the policy that is pursued by this Government in the matter of education. I shall reserve my remarks on this point, when I come to another amendment which has been given notice of. For the present I would confine my remarks to the necessity of my amendment to that of my hon. Friend, Mr. Nachiappa Goundar. The history of the definition of the term ‘ standard rate ’ is a very antiquated one; the standard rate was prescribed years ago under the Madras Education Rules, without any relation whatsoever to the rates that were being levied by various aided schools in this presidency, and the anomaly came to the forefront when the question of payment of compensation by local authorities introducing compulsory education in the area took concrete shape. To illustrate this point, I invite the attention of the House to the fact when the Madras Corporation was faced with the question of the payment of compensation to aided schools under the Elementary Education Act, the Corporation was permitted only to pay

[Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar] [3rd November 1931]

compensation to the extent of one and one-fifth of the standard rate. The standard rate was fixed by the Government with reference to their own schools, viz., schools under public management and not with reference to any private school. Taking that rate into consideration, the amount that the Madras Corporation was allowed to pay by the Government, was not sufficient even to meet one-fourth of the actual cost that was being incurred by aided institutions in running their schools. Thanks to the very reasonable attitude taken by the Madras Corporation, enquires were made in the matter and a responsible body like that came to the conclusion that the payment of compensation permissible under the Elementary Education Act would not meet the justice of the case and, from time to time, the Madras Corporation has been pleased to pay enhanced compensation to aided institutions. The compensation that was paid by them was sometimes four times the standard rate and at other times three times the rate. I think it is my duty, as one connected with an aided institution, to point out to the Members of this House that no private or aided institution can carry on the work of running a school if compensation is paid at the standard rate. I therefore think that my amendment is necessary, because it will be impossible to carry on the work of aided institutions at the standard rate prescribed under the Act. That is the reason why I am compelled to move this amendment to that of Mr. Nachiyappa Goundar."

Mr. V. T. Arasu seconded the amendment.

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, if either the original amendment of my hon. Friend, Mr. Nachiyappa Goundar, or the amendment in its present amended form is accepted, I must say that that will defeat the very object with which this Bill has been introduced.

1-30 p.m. "In the existing Act, the provision is that no school, whether it be under public management or under private management, shall levy any fees. There is also the provision that the managers of private schools shall be compensated by the local authority for the loss of income consequent upon this non-levy of fees. In the City of Madras and in a number of municipalities in the mufassal, about 25 in number, compulsion has been introduced, as a result of which no fees are to be levied in these areas in private schools, and the local authorities have to compensate the private schools. Experience has shown that the present system has been quite unworkable. It has led to a number of difficulties and also has resulted in considerable abuse. Particularly in the City of Madras have these difficulties been more marked than in the mufassal municipalities. It is as a result of what we have found by actual experience in working out these sections that the Government have felt the need for amending the existing provisions. In this respect, the Corporation and most of the private managements in the City of Madras have been pressing upon the Government that the existing provisions of the Act are unworkable and that they have to

3rd November 1931] [Mr. S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar]

be amended, and it is in pursuance of the request of both these bodies of people that the present Bill has been introduced. And if, therefore, the amendment now moved is accepted, namely, that fees are not to be levied in private schools and the old system of compensation must continue, I do not see any further purpose in enacting this amending Bill at all.

“ I may point out, Sir, that a statutory prohibition of the levy of fees in private schools appears to be a thing unknown in any other province in this country. Enactments similar to our Elementary Education Act are found in many of the other provinces. I have examined most of them; a prohibition is found in them against public bodies like municipalities and taluk boards levying fees in schools under their management. But there is no provision that private schools ought not to levy fees at all—not even in a compulsory area. I would say that in the larger interests of primary education in this country, it is necessary that private schools should be enabled to levy fees. If the parent of a child prepared to pay for the education of the child wants in return for the payment that he makes a better kind of education than the common free schools are prepared to give, the existing provision of the Act would not make it possible for him to get that kind of education. There is a statutory prohibition against the private manager levying any fee. If he does so in spite of the provisions of the Act, he makes himself liable to the penalties attaching to a violation of the sections of this Act. I may also say that the result of making all schools free will be to reduce the educational institutions in this country to a type-design of a very inferior sort. If you stifle private enterprise and kill all endeavours to impart a better kind of education, education on the lines that we find in the educationally advanced countries of the West, I ask my hon. Friends in this House to say if that is a thing which they ought to advocate in the interests of education in this country. Of course, if education is made compulsory in any particular area, it is necessary to provide free schools. But the principle which this Bill embodies is that private managers ought not to be prohibited from levying fees, ought not to be prohibited from running a better kind of institution than the common school which the public management is prepared to provide and where no fees are levied at all. That is the object of this Bill, Sir.

“ Then, Sir, my Friend asked me whether even in compulsory areas private schools are in a position to levy fees. I said in all other enactments even where compulsion has been introduced by the local authority with the sanction of the Government, there is no such embargo on private managements against levying fees. I may also, with your leave, Sir, point out to hon. Members of this House that the object of enacting the Elementary Education Act of 1920 was not to introduce at once universal compulsory education throughout the province. If that was the object and if the provisions of that Act aimed at introducing such compulsory education throughout the province which was also free, I can certainly be charged with going back on the provisions of the Act and with having taken a retrograde

[Mr. S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar] [3rd November 1931]

step. But it would be clear from the Preamble to the Act itself that that was not the object of enacting this legislative provision at all. As the Preamble expressly says, the object was only to make better provision for elementary education in this province, and that this is the object is also made clearer by some of the sections in the Act itself. When a local authority makes an application to the Government to introduce compulsion in the whole or any portion of its area, the Government need not examine whether adequate free places have been provided throughout the area in which compulsion is sought to be introduced; they must be only satisfied that there is a reasonable prospect of the local authority providing an adequate number of free places; and there is also another provision which makes this position quite clear. If universal compulsion was intended by the Act—as my hon. Friends seem to think—the parent of any child who does not send his child of school-going age to a school would be liable to criminal prosecution. But that is not what it has provided for. Compulsion is not to be enforced except where there are adequate educational facilities within a mile of the residence of the child or within such other distance as the District Educational Council may fix. All these provisions, Sir, I submit, go to show that it was intended to introduce compulsion only so far as the existing state of things would permit; and not to introduce universal compulsion throughout the jurisdiction of any local authority seeking to start compulsion. So, in this view, Sir, I must say that I have not in the least made myself liable to the charge of changing in any manner the policy which has been laid down in the Elementary Education Act of 1920. Well, Sir, under the existing Act, as I said, local authorities have to compensate private schools. The local authorities have come forward and told the Government—the Corporation has said that and at least one municipality in the mufassal has said that—‘we refuse to pay the compensation which the Act has prescribed’ and it is not possible for the Government to enforce the payment of the compensation though the Act has provided for it, because we find that their budgets already show a deficit. When it is absolutely impossible for them to pay the compensation and when private schools are anxious that they should be continued, I ask my hon. Friends here to say what is the remedy that they would suggest. The only remedy is to restore the state of things which existed before this Act was passed. I may say, if you permit me, Sir, it was a mistake to have introduced the provision in the Act of 1920 itself, to place a permanent embargo on private schools levying fees, to compel parents, however unwilling they may be to do so, to send their children to private schools, and to provide for the payment of a compensation which—as experience has shown—is liable to abuse in many directions. The only alternative, as I said, Sir, left to the Government was to restore the *status quo ante* and that is what is sought to be done by the provisions of this Bill. The private schools can levy fees as they were doing before this Act came into force; and local authorities need not pay any compensation just as they were not bound to pay before this Act of 1920 was passed. I would

3rd November 1931] [Mr. S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar]

request hon. Members to view this question not in the interests of private managements or of any other vested interests that have accrued as a result of the Act of 1920, but in the larger interests of the advancement of elementary education and the development of elementary education on healthy and proper lines in this country; and when so viewed, there is no alternative left, but to accept the provisions of the amending Bill and to reject this amendment."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Mr. President, Sir, a correct appreciation of the amendment of Mr. Nachiappa Goundar will show that the whole Bill is quite unnecessary and need not be accepted by this House at all. The present Act, as it is now working is what exactly is meant by my Friend's amendment. No fees are levied in areas where compulsion is introduced. Then, Sir, we are, under the Act, bound to pay and we are paying the local authorities and the Corporation of Madras—the statutory compensation provided in the Act. Now, the question is when once compulsion is introduced in an area, the local authority has, I think, rightly conceived it that it is its duty to provide education for all the boys of school-going age in that area. But the local authority does not find it possible to maintain the required number of schools and bear the burden of a large number of schools required for a particular area. Since they are unable to do so, they seek the aid of private institutions which are existing in the particular area and come to an agreement with them saying 'since you are not levying any fees, and on account of your not levying any fees, you are likely to incur a loss, and since you are supplementing our task of education we shall pay you a certain amount to compensate you for the loss of income'. Well, Sir, the rules made under the Act provide for only one and one-fifth for the City of Madras and one for the mufassal area. The Corporation, since it thinks it is its duty to provide educational facilities for all the boys and girls within its area, has necessarily to seek the aid of other institutions to make up the deficiency which the Corporation is not itself able to make up. The view of the Corporation is that the privately managed schools are the agencies of the Corporation in the absence of itself being able to provide for all the boys in a particular area. With regard to this, Sir, the question arose as to whether the Corporation should pay the full fee compensation out of the Elementary Education Fund or out of the general revenues of the Corporation. The contention of the Corporation is that inasmuch as they are subsidizing to the spread of elementary education, they are entitled to pay out of the Elementary Education Fund; but the Government, for reasons which have not yet been divulged, say: 'No, we cannot allow that to be paid out of the Elementary Education Fund'.

"We are yet to know, Sir, from the Finance Department and from the hon. the Minister as to what exactly are the reasons why the Corporation or the local authority is not empowered to pay out of the Elementary Education Fund the full-fee compensation. The full-fee compensation has to be paid because the private managed schools have

[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed] [3rd November 1931]

lost the income which they were deriving before the introduction of compulsion in their particular area and because of the abolition of the levy of fees. The Corporation contends that the private managed schools are supplementing the activities of the Corporation in the spread of elementary education. It is only elementary education that is being imparted by these private schools instead of the Corporation. Why not then pay out of the Elementary Education Fund, for which a cess is raised and a certain proportion of the money is contributed by the Corporation while another portion is contributed by the Government? Now, Sir, if the Government were to accept the contention of the Corporation that the money that may be paid to these private aided schools is a necessary expenditure for the spread of elementary education and a legitimate expenditure, then the Government must say, 'Pay it out of the Elementary Education Fund'. But apparently, the Finance Department of the Government think differently, for in its Government Order, the Government say that any money paid out of the Elementary Education Fund is not authorized or legitimate, but any money paid out of the general revenues for this purpose would be regular and legitimate. Now, Sir, I submit the Finance Department of the Government should correct their notions and think that any sum paid to these private aided institutions, whether out of the Elementary Education Fund or out of the general revenues, is necessary and legitimate. Then, Sir, the difficulty will be set at rest. Instead of doing so, the hon. the Minister has come forward with this amending Bill. The Corporation is ready to pay the one and one-fifth statutory rate provided for under the rules (the hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—It is not). It is prepared to pay; it has been paying. The Corporation is ready to pay the one and one-fifth provided for under the Act or the rules under it. But it is not able to pay the full fee income. If it is able to pay the full fee income, then the Government would say: 'If you pay it out of the general revenues, we have no objection; but if you pay it out of the Elementary Education Fund, we have objection'. I want to know how the payment to these aided institutions out of the general revenues could be considered as valid or necessary or legitimate and how if the payment is made out of the Elementary Education Fund it is invalid, unnecessary and illegitimate. That is the position which I want the hon. Minister to make clear. Now, Sir, the net result of all these difficulties comes to this, that either the private aided institutions have to satisfy themselves with receiving only one and one-fifth of the statutory rate, or these aided institutions should close; and then the Corporation will have to take up the responsibility of providing elementary education for all boys and girls in those particular areas served at present by these aided schools. Obviously the Corporation is not able to take it up at the present day and it may not be possible until the education cess is raised to meet the extra expenditure that they will have to incur in maintaining schools in order to provide further educational facilities for all the boys and girls in a particular area. Now, Sir, the amendment of my hon. Friend from Salem only points to this fact that the

3rd November 1931] [Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

amending Bill is unnecessary and private aided institutions ought to be told that they are not entitled to get more than the statutory compensation provided for in the rules and that the Corporation or any local authority need not pay more. If the Corporation or the local authority makes up its mind, as the Corporation has already made up its mind not to pay anything more than the statutory compensation payable under the rules, then, Sir, the question becomes very simple and easily solved. Then the Government should come to the rescue of the aided institutions by allowing them to levy fees. The result is, although the Minister may not agree, that the quality of compulsion is greatly affected by the introduction of the principle of the levy of fees. How is the Corporation or the local authority going to enforce compulsion the moment you allow the levy of fees in some schools while is not able to provide the area with more schools? The poor boys cannot go to the aided institutions where fees are levied, and these poor boys will have to look up to the Corporation or the local authority for providing facilities for their education, and the Corporation or the local authority is not in a position financially to provide for all the boys, as it is bound to provide for if compulsion is to be effectively carried out. I submit the hon. Minister is thoroughly wrong when he says that the element of compulsion is not in the least affected; the whole element of compulsion is affected. Compulsion cannot be enforced if the levy of fees is to be brought into existence and if the required number of schools are not there; otherwise the compulsion will only be in name. The hon. the Minister referred to the preamble of the Act. I would invite his attention to the latter clauses which impose a penalty if the parent does not send his boy or girl of a certain age to school. Why is that provision put in there if compulsion is not to be really effective and real and if it is not to be enforced? If in the view of the hon. Minister, it is merely to be 'namke-vastey' why then do you retain these clauses? Why do you say, if certain conditions are satisfied, compulsion will be introduced and parents will be penalized for non-observance of the rule and a penalty of Rs. 50 will be levied? I think the hon. Minister should also remove those sections which penalize the parents. The net result is that the whole object of the long agitation started from the days of the late Mr. Gopala Krishna Ghokale is defeated the moment you introduce the levy of fees in areas where compulsion is introduced and particularly when it is not possible to provide for the required number of schools. I would suggest to the hon. the Minister that he should strongly impress on the private aided institutions and tell them that they should be satisfied with one and one-fifth of the statutory rate in the case of the Corporation and the single statutory rate in the case of the local authorities; the Corporation, the municipalities and local bodies should be told that they ought not to pay anything more than that. If the Corporation, the municipalities and local bodies are prepared and make up their mind and say 'No', then, Sir, the way is easy, and we do not require this Act. If the Corporation and the municipalities have to give effect to the great idea of compulsion with

[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed] [3rd November 1931]

a view to spread education and have to provide for such education, how else could they provide for it unless they are enabled to pay out of the Elementary Education Fund? A necessary element of compulsion, if it is to be effective, is that education should be given free, that all opportunities and facilities should be afforded so that boys and girls may get themselves educated without paying for it. Under these circumstances, if the amendment of my hon. Friend from Salem is to be accepted, then we would be going back to the position that the Corporation is well within its rights in refusing to pay the full fee compensation to private managers, who must be satisfied with accepting merely the one and one-fifth standard rate provided for under the rules made under the Act, and do not bother the Minister and the Members with this Amending Bill."

Mr. M. A. MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR:—"I move that the question be now put."

The motion was put and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I will now put the amendment of Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar to the vote of the House. The question is—

'that the words 'calculated at standard rates as prescribed' be deleted from the proviso in the amendment moved by Mr. Nachiyappa Goundar.'

The amendment was declared lost. A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. | 10. Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar. |
| 2. Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 11. Mr. A. B. Shetty. |
| 3. Mr. Yakub Hasan. | 12. Mr. G. Simhachalam. |
| 4. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar. | 13. Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyyar. | 14. K. Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur. |
| 6. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 15. Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Goundar. |
| 7. Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur. | 16. The Pattagar of Palayakottai. |
| 8. Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 17. Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt. |
| 9. B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur. | 18. Mr. K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar. |
| | 19. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar. |
| | 20. Mr. V. T. Arasu. |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahmomed Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 7. The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 2. " Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar. | 8. Mrs. K. Alamelumanga Thayaramma. |
| 3. " Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell. | 9. Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham. |
| 4. " Mr. H. G. Stokes. | 10. Mr. J. A. Thorne. |
| 5. " Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. | 11. Mr. H. M. Hood. |
| 6. " Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 12. Mr. R. Madanagopal Nayudu. |
| | 13. Mr. S. V. Ramamurti. |
| | 14. Mr. E. Conran Smith. |

3rd November 1931]

Noes—cont.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 15. Mr. T. Sundara Rao Nayudu. | 36. Mr. H. B. Ari Gowder. |
| 16. Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur. | 37. Pandit Ganala Ramamurti. |
| 17. Mr. K. C. M. Venkatachela Reddiyar. | 38. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanya Chetti. |
| 18. Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi. | 39. The Zamindar of Kirlampudi. |
| 19. Mr. M. Devadasan. | 40. Rao Sahib C. Jayaram Nayudu. |
| 20. Mr. N. Siva Raj. | 41. Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami. |
| 21. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. | 42. Rao Sahib Badeti Venkataramayya. |
| 22. Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar. | 43. Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo. |
| 23. Mr. M. Vedachala Mudaliyar. | 44. Mr. W. M. Browning. |
| 24. Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi. | 45. Mr. F. Birley. |
| 25. Mr. M. S. Sreshta. | 46. Mr. R. Foulkes. |
| 26. Mr. P. V. Rajagopala Pillai. | 47. Mr. W. E. Winter. |
| 27. Mr. V. G. Vasudeva Pillai. | 48. Mr. F. E. James. |
| 28. Mr. C. Indrayya. | 49. Mr. J. Kuppuswami. |
| 29. Mr. P. Bayappa Reddi. | 50. Mr. C. Satyanarayana Choudari. |
| 30. Mr. T. Narasa Reddi. | 51. Mr. A. Ramakrishna Reddi. |
| 31. Mr. R. M. Palat. | 52. Khan Bahadur Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur. |
| 32. Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai. | 53. Mr. G. Sriramulu. |
| 33. The Zamindar of Mirjapuram. | 54. Mr. H. M. Jagannatham. |
| 34. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar. | 55. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai. |
| 35. Mr. J. A. Davis. | 56. Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur. |
| | 57. Mr. G. R. Premayya. |

Neutral.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. P. C. Moses. | 4. Mr. K. M. Duraiswami Reddiyar. |
| 2. Mr. P. C. Muthu Chettiyar. | 5. Mr. C. Basu Dev. |
| 3. Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed. | |

Ayes 20. Noes 57. Neutral 5.

The amendment was lost.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I will now put the amendment of Mr. Nachiyappa Goundar to the vote of the House. The question is—

'For the proposed sub-section (2) of section 47 and the proviso thereto, substitute the following, viz.:—

"(2) No fees shall be levied from any such child at any other elementary school situated in the said area:

Provided that the loss of fee income calculated at standard rates as prescribed shall be paid to such school by the local authority or panchayat concerned by way of compensation from its elementary education fund.'

The amendment was lost.

The House then adjourned for lunch to meet again at 3 p.m.

After Lunch (3 p.m.)

* Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"I move—

'In sub-section (2) add the following at the end: "except where such area is the City of Madras or is in the City of Madras".'

"Sir, I am sorry I am compelled to move this amendment because I know the intention of the hon. Minister when he brought this measure. If this Bill be passed without any alteration instead of mending the Elementary Education Act it will end the compulsory education in the

[Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar] [3rd November 1931]

city. When this Bill was sent to the Select Committee, I thought it would come out in the most acceptable form. But the most disputed clause 10 came out without any alteration, in spite of the protests made by my colleagues in the Corporation, who were on the committee. If this Bill becomes an Act compulsion will be withdrawn, rather must be withdrawn in the city. About 30,000 children are being educated in these aided schools. They are doing so at a very cheap rate to the Corporation. The Corporation is spending now about six lakhs but it will have to spend 12 lakhs hereafter. Children now reading in schools will flock to the Corporation schools. But who are the children that will be most affected? It is the depressed classes children. A number of the depressed classes children who were seeking appointments on one rupee and two rupees are going to these schools. As it at present stands they will do so till their 11th year. If this Bill is passed into law about 20,000 children of the City of Madras will go without education. Sir, if the hon. Minister had accepted the amendment that was moved this morning, it would have been at least a compromise. It was a very moderate one and as hon. Member Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed said it might be a compromise which will be accepted by the Corporation. Then I would not have had the necessity to move this amendment. Now I am compelled to move this amendment. If this is not accepted there will be an end to compulsion in Madras. Sir, moreover, there is so much strong opinion against this Bill that the hon. Minister must not force it through. At a meeting of the teacher-managers held yesterday which was presided over by their representative in the District Educational Council, they protested against passing of this Bill. When the Corporation is collecting the education cess how can people pay more money as fee for these children. I agree with my Friend, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti in his protest except when he said why should rich man pay for the poor. From ancient times it has been the rich man that has been paying the poor. I am extremely thankful to my colleagues in the Corporation who are on the Council and the hon. Members representing the city for putting up such a strong fight. If the Bill is passed without any consideration for the representatives of the City of Madras, of course the hon. Minister will be responsible for the consequences. So, Sir, I have no option except to move this amendment. There are some people who ask why the Council of the Corporation did not side with me. In the Corporation we represent 1/30 of the city. Here we represent the whole city. As we do not represent the Corporation but the city we may express our independent views in safeguarding the interest of the city. There is Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti representing the city, Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan representing the city, myself representing the city, and Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar representing the intelligentsia not only of the city but of the whole Presidency. We are all against the Bill. As to Mr. Madanagopal and Mr. Sundara Rao Nayudu they cannot oppose the Bill. Government brings the Bill; they are part and parcel of the Government. So they are to be excused. So, Sir, I request the hon. Minister to accept the amendment and make compulsion a permanent thing in Madras."

3rd November 1931]

* Mr. V. T. ARASU:—“ Mr. President, Sir, I have great pleasure in seconding the amendment moved by my Friend Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar who, I may incidentally point out, is the first and foremost citizen of Madras. Therefore I am sure that this House will take it that he is voicing the views of Madras as a whole, and refuse to accept this Bill. As has been rightly pointed out by Mr. Natesa Mudaliyar, if this Bill is passed into law it will put an end to compulsion altogether. Instead of passing such a Bill, we can as well repeal the Elementary Education Act of 1920. In Madras City and several other municipalities in the districts compulsion has not been enforced on account of the fact that there are not enough schools. It is on account of this fact that several children, as pointed out by Mr. Natesa Mudaliyar, have sought employment in some of these small and minor factories on wages ranging between one to two annas a day and these children are now going without any education. If this Bill is passed, even the children who are now in schools would abandon education, as they cannot possibly pay fees which aided schools will hereafter have to ask of them. The effects of this Bill are far reaching, and I would therefore request the hon. the third Minister to withdraw this Bill from this House or at least to accept the amendment moved by my hon. Friend Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar.”

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—“ Mr. President, Sir, I cannot accept this amendment. As the Mover himself pointed out the need for this amendment is felt more in the City of Madras than any other part of the Presidency. I do not think the provisions of this Bill are in any way going to really prejudice the state of things so far as the city is concerned. When there is no school within a distance of one mile compulsion cannot be enforced. I do not think there is any division in which there is no free school within one mile. I could not certainly follow my hon. Friend when he frightened the House by saying that the children of the depressed and backward classes will be turned adrift. It is a most unfounded apprehension. Concessions which under the existing rules the pupils of the depressed classes are enjoying will certainly not be affected by the amendment. Concession with regard to the midday meal is one that is given by the Corporation itself. It is not done by private schools. There is no reason why the Corporation should not continue the same concession after this Bill is passed into law. I therefore submit there is absolutely no reason why the City of Madras should be excluded. It is in this city that compulsion was first introduced: and it is here that the difficulties of the present system are felt more than in any other part of the Presidency. Therefore the sooner the present system is done away with the better for education and compulsion in the City of Madras.”

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—“ It is really unfortunate that this Government—I must rather say this Ministry—should take upon itself the odium of having passed this very restricted measure so far as elementary education is concerned. The hon. the Minister in his former speeches on this measure tried his utmost to remove that apprehension from the minds of the Members of this House. I must admit that he

[Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan] [3rd November 1931]

3-15
p.m.

has failed to clear the ground. Nobody who is interested in the advancement of elementary education either in the City or in the mufassal will agree with the hon. Minister or those who agree with him that this measure is going to help or advance elementary education in any area where compulsion is introduced. So far as the City is concerned it may be that the Corporation has found very many difficulties in administering this Act so far as compulsion is concerned with regard to the compensation to be paid to the teacher-managers of aided schools. The difficulty arises with regard to the rates that have to be paid. If it is possible in the metropolis for the Corporation to pay at the standard rate the Corporation would not have found any difficulty. It would have easily paid from the education fund. But in the city where things are different to what are found in the mufassal, it is impossible for any teacher-manager of an aided school to carry on his school without sufficient compensation being paid by the Corporation which has introduced compulsion. My hon. Friend, Mr. James, who is also a member of the Corporation, is of opinion that if they cannot carry on a school without sufficient compensation from the Corporation, the only alternative for them should be to close down their schools. Of course, it is very easily done. It is more easily said also. I do not know if it is really the object of the hon. Minister and whether he agrees with Mr. James that all the aided schools should be closed. Then, there must be the other alternative, that the Corporation itself which has introduced compulsion in the city should establish more schools instead of those aided schools. As to whether it will be possible for the Corporation to open more schools, Sir, facts and figures have been given in this House that if the Corporation should replace the existing aided schools by its own schools it has to incur a very high expenditure, at least to the extent of twice the amount that it will have to pay as compensation for the aided schools. (Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo: What is the basis for compensation?) Sir, it is impossible to establish a principle. Because, we know that various amounts of money are spent in various schools. It will be possible for a teacher-manager school managed by an Indian with a teacher or two in a particular locality to run a school at a cheap cost, but certainly it is not possible for a missionary institution to conduct a school at the same rate. The amount of loss that is incurred in running a school by these various bodies varies, and therefore it is not possible to answer my hon. Friend and say that a certain rate can be established and it will be possible to pay compensation at that fixed rate. (Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo: The Act does not provide for arbitrary compensation.) Sir, in order to enable the Corporation to pay the necessary amount of compensation, in order to enable those aided teacher-managers to conduct their schools without any loss, it should have been necessary for the hon. Minister to have come forward with a Bill which could enable the Corporation to pay the compensation from its education fund. It is only when the Corporation is called upon to pay a certain amount of the compensation from its general funds that the trouble

3rd November 1931] [Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan]

comes. If the Corporation is enabled to pay the entire amount that is necessary to make up the loss that is incurred by the aided manager from the education funds, that trouble will be over. But the remedy that is sought to be given to cure the disease which has been brought to the notice of the hon. Minister is certainly not a remedy but it is worse than the disease which is sought to be cured by it. The number of schools in the area of the city will be considerably decreased. All the aided managers who have been able to carry on their schools with the help of the Corporation in the shape of compensation will be compelled to close down their schools, and the result will be, as I said on a former occasion, the talk of compulsion in the city of Madras will be a farce. It will certainly be not compulsion. There would not be sufficient number of schools for all the school-going children. On the other hand, what will happen is influential people, people who have got influence with the teachers of the Corporation schools in their locality or with the Councillors of the division will find it easy to get their children admitted into Corporation schools, and they will be rich people. The people who will suffer will be the poorer people and they may not have the opportunity to get their children admitted into these Corporation schools.

“ The finances of the Corporation, as the Government may be aware, are certainly not good. It is estimated that the Corporation will incur a deficit of three or four lakhs. With such depleted finances it will not be possible for the Corporation to increase the number of schools. It has already found it difficult to run the large number of schools that are existing at present with the finances at the disposal of the Corporation. The only remedy, if it is the honest intention of the Ministry to advance elementary education not only in the city of Madras but throughout the province, if it is the honest intention of the Government to see that elementary education is not muzzled, is to enable the local bodies to pay the full fee compensation from the education fund. Unless they do not, they will certainly be giving elementary education a set back, and they will be responsible for passing this retrograde measure which will certainly bring a stigma on the name of the Ministry that is in power just now.”

* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—“ Sir, under section 47 of the Elementary Education Act, it was intended that this compensation for loss of fee income should be given only for such period and in such manner as may be prescribed. Well, of course, in every year it has to be taken into consideration how much loss there would be in the income of those aided schools, and the compensation should be based upon that calculation. Now, we find that from a particular year after giving notice to these aided managers this compensation is to be stopped. Where is the injustice I cannot see. It was never contemplated under the Act that these people should permanently get a second grant-in-aid beside the grant-in-aid they are getting through the District Educational Council. It was intended that only some compensation should be given and that only for such period and in such manner as may be found necessary. There is absolutely no reason why the city people should

[Sriman M. G. Patnaik] [3rd November 1931]

complain of injustice when the working of the Act is according to its spirit facilitated by the amending Bill. All that this measure seeks to do is to restore the *status quo ante*. But as the Act puts an embargo on charging fees, that embargo is now being removed. I do not see what injustice is being done by this bill. If the aided schools were till now getting a very large sum, far above the standard rates, they must thank the Government as well as the Corporation for having got all that income. They cannot be paid this large sum by way of compensation for all time.

“There is a threat that these schools will be closed. But I think that these schools will never be closed as they are getting large sums of money by way of grants-in-aid. So long as they are paid the grants-in-aid and also allowed to charge fees, I do not think we are doing any injustice to them or retarding the spread of elementary education in this province.”

Mr. R. MADANAGOPAL NAYUDU:—“President, Sir, I was unfortunately not here when some remarks were made about one or two of us here as muzzled though we are members of the Corporation. I for one should like to say that there is nothing in the position in which I find myself placed. Because, at the time compulsion was sought to be introduced in the city, I had expressed myself clearly that I was in favour of compulsion but not in favour of making elementary education free because the finances of the Corporation would not permit it. That is the position which I took ten years back, and that is the same position which I take to-day. Sir, it is not on account of changed circumstances in which I am placed to-day that I hold that view. Therefore, I wanted to say that I was already in favour of a position like the one in the present Bill.

“As regards the poor children who might be compelled to attend schools, I was of opinion that some sort of vocational training side by side with education in the three R's would compensate the parent who lost the earning capacity of the children whom he was compelled to send to these schools. That is always the position I hold on this matter. So, I am glad that we are coming to days when we will have compulsion, at the same time education not being free.

“Well, Sir, it has been said that a number of aided schools is likely to be closed at least in the city immediately this Bill is passed into law. I feel, Sir, that it will not be so at all, and that the schools at present functioning would in my opinion continue to function in future. My opinion is that the majority of the teacher-managers at least are anxious that we should pass this provision (Voices: Question, question). There may be one section of them who are opposed to this measure. But I have reason to feel convinced that a large majority of teacher-managers of private aided schools in the city of Madras is in favour of this measure being passed. (A Voice: Despair!) It is not a question of despair. My opinion is that they are in favour because it is much more advantageous to them if we pass this provision of law, and it will probably enable them to get more income. The sort of difficulty which Mr. Hameed Khan felt is likely to be experienced by the poor

3rd November 1931] [Mr. R. Madanagopal Nayudu]

people is not in my opinion a good reason for going back and cancelling a provision of this kind in the Bill to charge fees. I have been a Councillor of the Corporation for three years and I have never had any occasion when I was approached by anybody for recommendation for admission into the Corporation school. Of course, a number of people who can afford to pay fees will always be willing to send their children to schools charging fees, and it is generally the children of poor people that will go to the Corporation schools, and that will not at all lead to any sort of recommendation becoming necessary for admission into these schools. Therefore, I think that the 142 schools, the Corporation is running to-day are likely to be filled by the children of poor people, and yet a number of children that can afford to pay the fees to be charged by the private managers will be found to fill the aided schools. And I do not think that much difficulty will be found by them to get boys. That is the position I wanted to make clear now, and I have been of that opinion not only to-day but for a number of years past."

The amendment was put and declared lost.

Mr. V. T. Arasu demanded a poll and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur. | 5. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar. |
| 2. Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan. | 6. Mr. V. T. Arasu. |
| 3. Mr. K. M. Duraiswami Reddiyar. | 7. Mr. H. M. Jagannatham. |
| 4. Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt. | |

Noes.

- | | | |
|--|---|--------------|
| 1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahmud Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 25. Mr. P. V. Rajagopala Pillai. | 3-30
p.m. |
| 2. „ Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar. | 26. Mr. V. G. Vasudeva Pillai. | |
| 3. „ Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell. | 27. The Zamindar of Kirlampudi. | |
| 4. „ Mr. H. G. Stokes. | 28. Rao Sahib C. Jayaram Nayudu. | |
| 5. „ Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. | 29. Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami. | |
| 6. „ Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 30. Mr. C. Indrayya. | |
| 7. „ Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 31. Mr. P. Bayappa Reddi. | |
| 8. Mrs. K. Alamelunga Thayaramma. | 32. Mr. T. Narasa Reddi. | |
| 9. Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham. | 33. Mr. R. M. Palat. | |
| 10. Mr. J. A. Thorne. | 34. Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai. | |
| 11. Mr. H. M. Hood. | 35. Rao Sahib B. Venkataramayya. | |
| 12. Mr. R. Madanagopal Nayudu. | 36. Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo. | |
| 13. Mr. S. V. Ramamurti. | 37. Pandit Ganala Ramamurti. | |
| 14. Mr. E. Conran Smith. | 38. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanya Chetti. | |
| 15. Mr. T. Sundara Rao Nayudu. | 39. Mr. J. A. Davis. | |
| 16. Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur. | 40. The Raja of Kallikote. | |
| 17. Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi. | 41. Mr. F. G. Luker. | |
| 18. Mr. M. Devadasan. | 42. Mr. W. M. Browning. | |
| 19. Mr. N. Siva Raj. | 43. Mr. F. Birley. | |
| 20. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. | 44. Mr. R. Foulkes. | |
| 21. Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar. | 45. Mr. W. E. Winter. | |
| 22. Mr. M. Vedachala Mudaliyar. | 46. Mr. F. E. James. | |
| 23. Mr. R. P. Sessa Reddi. | 47. Mr. J. Kuppuswami Choudari. | |
| 24. Mr. M. S. Sreshta. | 48. Mr. C. Satyanarayana Choudari. | |
| | 49. Mr. C. Basu Dev. | |
| | 50. Mr. A. Ramakrishna Reddi. | |
| | 51. Khan Bahadur Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur. | |
| | 52. Mr. G. Sriramulu. | |
| | 53. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai. | |
| | 54. Mr. W. P. A. Soundara Pandiyan. | |
| | 55. Mr. G. R. Premayya. | |
| | 56. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar. | |

[3rd November 1931]

Neutral.

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. | 8. B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur. |
| 2. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. | 9. Mr. M. A. Manikkāvelu Nayakar. |
| 3. Mr. Yakub Hasan. | 10. Mr. A. B. Shetty. |
| 4. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar. | 11. Mr. G. Simhachalam. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar. | 12. Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed. |
| 6. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 13. Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur. |
| 7. Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur. | 14. Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Goundar. |
| | 15. The Pattagar of Palayakottai. |
| | 16. Mr. K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar. |

Ayes 7. Noes 56. *Neutral* 16.

The amendment was lost.

* Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"I move the amendment which stands in my name, viz.—

‘Add as new sub-section (3) the following:—

“That in any case where school fees levied under sub-section (2) should fall short of the compensation that is now being paid to such aided school, such difference shall be made good for a period of first three years by an enhanced grant from the Government or by the local authority.”’

“Sir, I rise to move this amendment governed by the same feelings that a man might entertain when asking for small mercies of a triumphant conqueror. At the outset I must say that this is a compromise amendment. However much my view may be different from that which has been expressed by a majority of this House, on the question whether compulsory education should be free or should not be free, I shall accept the effect that would be produced by this Bill as an inevitable evil. And it is that reason that has prompted me to come forward with this amendment, because I am aware of the special difficulties which will entail for some time at least on the aided and private institutions, not only in the city but also in the mufassal. Sir, after the very graceful compliment that has been paid by the hon. Minister in charge of Education to the contribution that private and aided institutions have made towards the expansion of elementary education in this Presidency, it is unnecessary for me to dilate on the effect this Bill would have on such aided institutions or to point out how they would be crippled from making a similar contribution in future to the cause of education. Sir, I may just invite the attention of the hon. Members of the House to the fact that not only the Corporation of Madras but also the officers of the Government have invoked the aid of private aided institutions in this city without which no complete programme of compulsory education can be undertaken and much less executed. In this connexion I would invite the attention of the hon. Members to a statement made by Mr. Statham, M.A., I.E.S., Special Officer for Elementary Education, in his report that illiteracy can be successfully removed through the aided agencies and mainly with the help of aided agencies.

3rd November, 1931] [Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar]

The Corporation appointed a special councillor to examine the whole question, and he states in his report 'the Corporation must of course seek the co-operation of well-conducted aided schools to secure the successful working of the compulsory scheme.' While, therefore, this is an admitted fact, that without the help of aided institutions no real progress in elementary education can be made, it seems to me very hard that even this small mercy for which we are pleading should not be extended to these institutions by the hon. Minister in charge of this portfolio. Sir, I shall briefly explain to the hon. Members the special hardships that may entail on aided institutions. I am aware that even among private aided institutions there are two sets of opinions; some schools are for the levy of fees, while others desire full fee compensation. I belong to that set of schools which has given me a mandate that if the levy of fees is an accomplished fact, it will accept that fact and make sincere efforts to work the Act. Some observation has been made by a previous speaker that inefficient schools are most clamorous for the continuance of the system of payment of fee compensation. That observation is utterly unfounded. There are no doubt some schools which honestly feel that in the present situation the system of fee levy would be absolutely unworkable. Sir, I do not want to hold a brief for those institutions which in face of competition are bound to be wiped out. But there are certain schools which represent indigenous effort, which are actuated by a spirit of public work and public service and which have stood the competition of time and have been carrying on the torch of knowledge. These institutions are placed in a position of jeopardy by reason of this Bill from which they cannot escape. I shall illustrate what I mean. There are several private aided institutions which have been doing efficient work and against which even the most unkind critic cannot raise his little finger. I represent one of such institutions, known as the Hindu Union Committee School; and perhaps this will be an example which will illustrate the proposition that I wish to bring to the notice of this House. What is the position of the school now after the starting of free compulsory education in the Madras city? Round about our institution, the Corporation has started several other institutions in which no fee is levied. The result is that in the particular locality, within a radius of less than two furlongs, there is a ring of schools. The result that would follow by reason of the levy of fees in this private aided institution, while the Corporation schools are free, would be, human tendency being what it is, that students from this school would be driven away into the Corporation schools because education there is free. There is no use of shutting our eyes to the actual psychological processes. My Friend Mr. Patnaick observed that private institutions are not going to suffer any loss by this Bill. If they are fully attended, if they get an income sufficient for the running of schools we shall be doubly glad, glad because we stand on our own legs and glad that we are not compelled to go and beg for small mercies from the Corporation and the Government. But I am afraid that is not going to be. The strength of our school would be considerably affected, and the result will be that an

[Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar] [3rd November 1931]

institution built up with such great effort will in the course of a few months be wiped off. That is why I have come forward with this amendment. In my amendment I have put three years, but I am prepared to accept a lesser period even. I plead that special aid should be given to private institutions of this kind by way of enhanced grant or subsidy from the local authority.

3-45
p.m.

“ I am stating that during the transitory period, these institutions should receive certain extra help or enhanced grant. In doing so, Sir, it is very necessary for us to remember one other fact. Especially in the city of Madras we have embarked upon the policy of compulsory and universal elementary education. Now, Sir, it is admitted by hon. Members who are also members of the Corporation of Madras that so far as the Corporation is concerned, for some time to come, they cannot undertake any programme of expansion of elementary education. Their finances will not permit new schools being built or opened. Therefore the result of this would be that many of the private institutions being obliged to curtail their activities, the Corporation in its turn not expanding their activities, a number of school-going children will be left adrift without any school to go to. They will have no schooling. That is not the idea underlying the introduction of compulsory elementary education in the city of Madras. Now, I ask whether any serious action can be contemplated if a parent does not send his child to school, because, so far as the parent is concerned, the number of schools in the city of Madras manned by the Corporation cannot accommodate his child also. A poor parent may not be in a position to send his child even to a private aided school even if it is willing to take his boy. The result will be that, under the Act, he is liable to be punished by being asked or compelled to send his child to a school within one mile of his house. Now, I ask, has this situation been taken into consideration in attempting to make an important change of the nature proposed in the Bill? Sir, as I was saying, a poor parent will now have to look to the Corporation schools for the education of his child. The Corporation says: We have got 134 schools now and all our schools are full and there is no room for any more. The result will be that the boy will be compelled to fall back upon private agency and the private agency will not take him unless he pays school fees. Sir, that is the position and it was not contemplated when it was decided to impart elementary education compulsorily.

“ Sir, in this connexion the question arises, and it is a fundamental question, whether compulsory education should be free or should not be free. But my only object at present is, to make a special appeal to the hon. Minister, to give special help to the aided institutions during the transitory period when this Act is going to come into force. The reason why this help is necessary for a brief period has been explained in this House over and over again. One reason is that, so far as the city of Madras is concerned, we have been accustomed to free schooling

3rd November 1931] [Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar]

for the past five or six years and any sudden change now would upset all our calculations. The parents will find it extremely difficult to adjust themselves to the new order of things.

“ In the second place, if this Act is to come into force, so far as the city of Madras concerned, it should be from the 1st January 1932. And the reason is this: The Corporation has stated that it is not going to pay any compensation from 1st January 1932, so that, aided institutions, if they have to go on at all, must levy fees from that date. Now, in the middle of the school year if a parent is suddenly asked to make provision for the payment of fees for his children, it will be extremely difficult for him to find the money. Even middle class people will find it difficult to find this money in their budgets.

“ Now, Sir, there is another aspect of the question so far as the city of Madras is concerned an aspect which will cut the tangle—and it is this: why should the Government not consent to the payment of fee compensation to these aided schools from the education fund? Sir, several responsible members of the Corporation of Madras, who are also members of this House have stated that if the Corporation is *permitted* to pay compensation from its elementary education fund, they would have no objection whatsoever to that course. The hon. Minister has very cleverly evaded that question put to him, viz., why the Corporation should not be permitted to pay compensation to the aided institutions in the city from and out of this fund and why they should be compelled to pay compensation from their general revenues. In answer to this question, so far as I am aware—and I have been following the debate on this Bill rather closely—no answer has been vouchsafed to us and the House has not been taken into confidence on that point. Sir, the effect of this Bill will be that the activities of several aided institutions will be curtailed and some will be closed down.

“ Sir, the suggestion has been made by some Members on the Treasury Bench and by my hon. Friend Mr. Madanagopal Nayudu that the real effect of this Bill will be that all those who can afford to pay school fee will go to the institutions which levy fees and all those who cannot afford to pay the fees will crowd into the Corporation school. There will be reduced strength in the aided schools. I do not know how this conclusion was arrived at. So far as I am concerned, I have got accurate data on that point. He knows the spirit which is actuating me to move in this matter. He knows the school to which I am referring. I sincerely desire that all schools should be placed on the same footing in the matter of affording reasonable facilities. Sir, if in order to wipe out these elementary schools this Bill has been introduced, it will have the effect of dragging along even the aided institutions. This action will be tantamount to the proverbial cutting of the nose to spite the face. My amendment makes provision only for a transitory period and it will not throw any great burden on the exchequer either of the Government or of the local authorities. With these few observations I have great pleasure in placing this motion before the House. I would appeal to

[Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar] [3rd November 1931]

the hon. Minister to accept the amendment. I would appeal to the hon. Members also to accept this amendment in view of the work which these aided institutions have been doing in the matter of education."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—"I second the amendment."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"I regret, Sir, I am constrained to oppose this motion. As an argument on behalf of the aided institutions, the speech made by the hon. Member is a very excellent one and perhaps cannot be surpassed; but in its application to the local authorities concerned, it assumes a different aspect. I can understand these aided institutions being allowed to levy fees or the local authorities being enabled to pay compensation. They cannot have it both ways. The amendment enables these educational institutions to levy fees from the children attending them and also to get money to be paid to them by the local authorities. If the local authorities are in a position to pay full compensation from not out of the education fund, but out of the general revenues, there is no reason why the amendment to the Bill should be introduced at all by the hon. Minister. I should therefore oppose this amendment.

"In this connexion, Sir, it would be very important for the House to know what the hon. Mr. Davidson said when he piloted the Elementary Education Bill in the year 1920. These words of his will throw a flood of light on what our present Minister for Education has been saying. This is what Mr. Davidson said:

"It is conceded that aided schools are entitled to full compensation for loss of fees in consequence of the introduction of compulsion and its corollary, the abolition of fees. And the question is whether the loss, which is roughly estimated between 7 and 8 lakhs, should be made good by the Government or by the local authority. I have shown that the local authority will benefit by the special cess and the contribution from Government to the extent of some 42 lakhs; that is to say, something like five times the loss falling on the school managers. And it is probable that this multiple will be higher, since it is likely that the Government contribution will be in excess of the sum actually raised by taxation. There is one way in which the Government may perhaps satisfy those who support the amendment, that is by accepting the proposal and at the same time making a secret resolve to reduce the provincial contribution given to local authorities in excess of the statutory limit by the amount which Government would have to pay in order to compensate school managers for loss of fees."

"Therefore the principle of free education as a corollary to compulsory education was admitted by the hon. Member Mr. Davidson and also the payment of full compensation for such fee income that was lost by these institutions. On these two important principles my hon. Friend Mr. Kumaraswami Reddiyar is going behind. The only way of frustrating this retrograde object of the hon. Minister will be to throw out this Bill without any ceremony."

* Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"I support the amendment, Sir. It is a compromise. I request the hon. Minister to accept it. Sir, if we decide to levy fees in aided schools, all the poor boys will go away from the aided schools and crowd into the Corporation schools and the result will be that the Corporation schools might become inefficient. Then there will be a reaction. Parents will like to send their

3rd November.1931] [Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar]

children to a school where the teacher will be responsible for the education of the child. Aided schools might once more flourish. This amendment wants provision for help during the interval. Otherwise aided schools may vanish. I would request the hon. Minister to accept the amendment and save all the compulsory educational agencies in the city and in the mufassal from being wiped off once for all.

“As my hon. Friend, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chettiyar said, many ^{4 p.10.} veteran gentlemen such as Sir Lionel Davidson and also Mr. Statham were enthusiastic supporters of the cause of free and compulsory education. Is it the policy of the hon. Minister to give a go-bye to all the solemn promises that he gave in favour of free and compulsory education? Moreover, if this Bill is passed all the rich people will be completely separated from the poor. It may affect the depressed classes. The depressed classes will not only go without any education, they will be completely separated from the richer folks and the separation of the rich from the poor is not conducive to the healthy growth of the nation. Even in ancient days the King's son and the village children were educated together in a Rishi's Asramam. I therefore request the hon. the Minister for Education to come to our rescue and save the city and this Presidency. Let him not stand on prestige. My hon. Friend Mr. Madanagopal Nayudu said he was against free and compulsory education from the beginning. When the scheme of compulsory education was contemplated the whole Corporation plunged into it. Where it was hesitating to spend one or two lakhs, it is now spending 8 lakhs of rupees. If the hon. Minister is not willing to concede this much the Corporation will have to spend about 12 lakhs of rupees out of about 60 lakhs of revenue. I finally appeal to the hon. Minister to come to the rescue of the city by accepting this amendment. This is the last straw which the drowning people are trying to catch at. I once more appeal to the Minister to accept the amendment and save the city and the Presidency.”

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—“I must say that I am strongly opposed to any amendment which will impose as its effect a statutory obligation on any local body to pay compensation. If my hon. Friend Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar had made his eloquent appeal to the Corporation instead of to the Government, I think it would have been more appropriate.”

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—“You are misrepresenting the whole thing. . .”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—“The Corporation has definitely passed a resolution whether from out of the elementary education fund or from their general revenues, they are not prepared to pay a pie to these private schools. To-day their Elementary Education Fund shows a deficit of many thousands of rupees. I do not know how the Legislature will be justified in imposing upon the Corporation or any other local bodies a statutory obligation to pay any compensation to schools. I cannot as a Member of the Government nor can the hon. the Chief Minister as the Minister in charge of Local

[Mr. S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar] [3rd November 1931]

Self-Government undertake to enforce this obligation if the local authorities are unwilling. My hon. Friend Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti when he put forward his case asked us to look at the question from the private manager's point of view. I beg this House not to look at the question from the narrow point of view of private managers. I am constrained to observe that some at least who spoke on this motion looked at the question from that narrow point of view and not from the point of view of the local bodies, and whether the local bodies are able to pay any compensation from out of their funds. These are questions which should be considered. In the existing state of things I am bound to say that it is impossible to enforce any obligation that may be imposed on local bodies to pay any compensation to schools. For that reason I am bound to oppose. If my hon. Colleagues of this Council who are also Members of the Corporation had made an appeal to the Corporation to make provision for giving compensation to the teacher-managers and other schools and succeeded, I would not have stood in their way; but now when the Corporation have declined to do so and have also communicated a copy of their resolution to the Government, I cannot see how I can accept any provision in this Bill compelling the Corporation to make a payment beyond their means."

The amendment was put to vote and lost.

Clause 10 was put and carried.

Clauses 11 and 12 were put and carried.

Clause 13 was put and carried.

The Schedule was put and carried.

The Preamble was put and carried.

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"I beg to move—

'that the Bill be now passed into law.'

"In moving this motion, I wish just to say a word or two. I must say that I do not share with several hon. Members of this House the feeling that this is a retrograde measure. If I had the slightest apprehension that this measure will in any manner arrest the progress which elementary education in this Province would otherwise have made under the existing Act, I should certainly not have piloted this Bill at all. I must say on the other hand that this measure will help the spread of elementary education and will facilitate the introduction of compulsion in areas where under the present Act difficulties are being experienced in regard to introduction of compulsion. From what I gather, what has stood in the way of several mufassal municipalities intending to introduce compulsion is the fear that the compensation that they would be called upon to pay to private schools under the provisions of this Act would be such a heavy drain upon the poor resources of the local bodies that they could not possibly undertake the introduction of compulsion in their areas. When that liability to pay compensation is removed by enabling

3rd November 1931] [Mr. S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar]

private schools to levy fees, the local bodies and municipalities in the mufassal areas will be in a better position to introduce compulsion in their respective jurisdiction. I am supported in this view by several of the hon. Members who are connected with district boards and municipalities. They have all told me not only privately but in the course of the discussion of the Bill in the Select Committee and at earlier stages that this Bill will help the introduction of compulsory elementary education. So I may, in reply to those hon. Members who have expressed the view that this is a retrograde step, say that this step, instead of retarding the progress will help the spread of elementary education in this Province, and will facilitate the introduction of compulsory elementary education in some of the mufassal areas. So far as the city is concerned, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that the better kind of private schools will continue to exist and will even prosper under the provisions of the amended Act. There is no fear whatever that they will disappear. Of course inefficient schools as Mr. Chettiyar observed may go out of existence. That is a matter for which we need not feel, in the least, sorry. For these reasons I beg to move that this Bill be passed into law."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The motion is that the Bill be passed into law."

* Mr. V. T. ARASU:—"Mr. President, Sir, I feel constrained to oppose the motion made by the hon. the Minister, for, I am positively certain that this Bill, if passed into law, is virtually going to put an end to compulsory education. The hon. the Minister in moving the motion said, with reference to the city of Madras, that this Bill is going to help the spread of elementary education. I can inform the hon. the Minister, Sir, that he is entirely wrong in thinking so. I may even go further and say—for I have some claim to speak on behalf of the citizens of Madras—that the citizens of Madras without any exception feel that this Bill is going to kill elementary education in the city."

Mr. F. E. JAMES:—"You are a nominated Member?"

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—"My hon. Friend, Mr. James, reminds me that I am a nominated Member. Under ordinary circumstances I should not have cared to answer that question. But since it has given me an opportunity to explain my position in regard to this Bill, I would inform Mr. James that the city of Madras would stand by me at all times. I would even go further and say that, if he has any doubts about that, I am prepared to demonstrate the same to his satisfaction. All that Mr. James, who is the un-official spokesman of the Ministers, has to do is to persuade one of his friends who at present happen to represent Madras, and who are sitting opposite to me, to resign his membership of the Council. In that case I am prepared to resign too and contest the seat. Mr. James will then come to know whether I have any claim to speak on behalf of the citizens of Madras, or not."

[Mr. V. T. Arasu]

[3rd November 1931]

“ Sir, coming to the Bill before the House, I was saying how it is going to adversely affect compulsory elementary education in the city of Madras. Mr. President, I have been a member of the Attendance Committee of the 24th Municipal Division of Madras, and for some time its president too; and in that capacity I have had opportunities of working compulsory elementary education. From the experience gained in that capacity, I may inform this House that even when education was free we were not able to drive all the children of school-going age into the schools. Now, Sir, when fees are going to be levied, how can we expect the poor parent not only to forego the one or two annas which the boy would earn if he entered a workshop, but also pay out of his small earning a fee of about eight annas a month for the education of the boy? My Friend, Mr. Madanagopal Nayudu, said that the poor boys would go into the Corporation schools and the richer ones into the private schools. Sir, it is impossible to think of such a position as long as human nature remains what it is. Every one, whether of the middle or the poor class, would prefer to send his child to the free school. Therefore, what is going to happen if this Bill is passed into law is this: All the children who are now reading in aided schools would leave those schools, and flock to the Corporation schools. It has been repeatedly pointed out on the floor of this House that there are only 140 Corporation schools, and that the maximum number that can be admitted into these schools is about 30,000. The total number of children of school-going age has been stated to be about 60,000. If these aided schools go out of existence—I am sure they will—where are these 30,000 children who are now in those schools to go? They will go without any education. And that would mean that compulsion has been put an end to. When that is going to be the result, why not take the more straightforward course of repealing the Act of 1920, and say that there is no compulsion?”

4-15 p.m. “ For these reasons, Sir, I oppose the motion of the hon. the Minister for Education.”

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—“ Sir, I have carefully listened to the various reasons advanced by the hon. Minister for Education for hoping that this measure would quicken the spread of elementary education in the Presidency, but I am not convinced that it would be so. This Bill is nothing but driving the thin end of the wedge in an attempt to deprive the depressed classes of the various facilities they have been enjoying under local boards and Government in the matter of educating their children. Hitherto the aided agencies have been getting some aid from the local boards and if that aid was stopped now they would naturally begin to levy fees. Once they begin to levy fees, the spread of mass education will be severely checked. From the point of view of the spread of education among the poor and the depressed classes, this measure is most unwelcome. I therefore oppose the Bill.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“ The question is—
‘ that the Bill be passed into law.’ ”

3rd November 1931]

The motion was declared carried. A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 24. Mr. V. G. Vasudeva Pillai. |
| 2. „ Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar. | 25. Mr. P. Bayappa Reddi. |
| 3. „ Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell. | 26. Mr. T. Narasa Reddi. |
| 4. „ Mr. H. G. Stokes. | 27. Mr. R. M. Palat. |
| 5. „ Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. | 28. Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai. |
| 6. „ Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 29. The Raja of Kallikote. |
| 7. „ Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 30. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram. |
| 8. Mrs. K. Alamelumanga Thayaramma. | 31. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar. |
| 9. Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham. | 32. Mr. J. A. Davis. |
| 10. Mr. J. A. Thorne. | 33. Pandit Ganala Ramamurti. |
| 11. Mr. H. M. Hood. | 34. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanya Chetti. |
| 12. Mr. R. Madanagopal Nayudu. | 35. The Zamindar of Kirlampudi. |
| 13. Mr. S. V. Ramamurti. | 36. Rao Sahib C. Jayaram Nayudu. |
| 14. Mr. E. Conran Smith. | 37. Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami. |
| 15. Mr. T. Sundararao Nayudu. | 38. Rao Sahib B. Venkataramayya. |
| 16. Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur. | 39. Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo. |
| 17. Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi. | 40. Mr. F. G. Luker. |
| 18. Mr. M. Devadasan. | 41. Mr. W. M. Browning. |
| 19. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. | 42. Mr. Frank Birley. |
| 20. Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar. | 43. Mr. R. Foulkes. |
| 21. Mr. M. Vedachala Mudaliyar. | 44. Mr. W. E. Winter. |
| 22. Mr. B. P. Sessa Reddi. | 45. Mr. F. E. James. |
| 23. Mr. P. V. Rajagopala Pillai. | 46. Mr. J. Kuppuswami Choudari. |
| | 47. Mr. C. Satyanarayana Choudari. |
| | 48. Mr. C. Basu Dev. |
| | 49. Mr. A. Ramakrishna Reddi. |
| | 50. Khan Bahadur Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur. |
| | 51. Mr. G. Sriramulu. |
| | 52. Mr. H. M. Jagannatham. |
| | 53. Mr. G. R. Premayya. |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. | 10. B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur. |
| 2. Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 11. Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar. |
| 3. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. | 12. Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. |
| 4. Mr. Yakub Hasan. | 13. Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan. |
| 5. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar. | 14. Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar. | 15. Ahmed Meeran Sahib Bahadur. |
| 7. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 16. Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Goundar. |
| 8. Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur. | 17. The Pattagar of Palayakottai. |
| 9. Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 18. Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt. |
| | 19. Mr. K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar. |
| | 20. Mr. V. T. Arasu. |
| | 21. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai. |

Ayes 53, Noes 21.

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“ The House will adjourn and meet again at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, the 26th January 1932.”

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.